

Duke, Daphne

From: Blan Holman [<mailto:bholman@selcsc.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2018 4:46 PM

To: Butler, David <David.Butler@psc.sc.gov>; K. Chad Burgess <chad.burgess@scana.com>; Benjamin Mustian <bmustian@willoughbyhoefer.com>; Bateman, Andrew <abateman@regstaff.sc.gov>; Pittman, Jenny <jpittman@regstaff.sc.gov>; alex@shissiaslawfirm.com; Richard Whitt <rlwhitt@austinrogerspa.com>; tfrogers@austinrogerspa.com; Scott Elliott <selliott@elliottlaw.us>

Subject: RE: DN 2018-2-E - Two Outstanding Motions

David,

CCL and SACE plan to file a response tomorrow in support of SBA's Motion to Bifurcate.

Regarding the 2017-2-E petition, CCL and SACE served the petition on SCE&G electronically and by first class mail on March 21. CCL and SACE requested expedited treatment by the Commission given the clear overlap with 2018-2-E.

SCE&G cites to Rule 103-830(B)(1)-(2) in seeking service directly from the Clerk and an additional 30 days to respond, but those rule provisions refer specifically to petitions for declaratory orders and petitions for a rule to show cause. CCL and SACE's petition is neither of these and thus should not require service by the Chief Clerk nor a full 30 days for response.

A more expedited schedule is warranted for the petition because the 2017-2-E Commission order at issue directed SCE&G to file updated and Commission-compliant PR-2 rates in the Company's 2018-2-E testimony. SCE&G failed to do this, impairing the ability of parties in the 2018-2-E docket to adequately respond to their proposals. If SCE&G proceeds on its desired schedule of awaiting service from the Clerk and another 30 days to respond, the testimony deadlines and hearing in the 2018-2-E proceeding will have already passed. This is why CCL and SACE requested in the petition that the Commission require SCE&G's compliance with filing the PR-2 updated rates within seven days, so that this issue might be addressed with supplemental testimony before the April 10 hearing in 2018-2-E. If SCE&G needs additional time for a response, then setting a response deadline of Monday, April 2 for both the motion to bifurcate and the 2017-2-E petition would, at a minimum, allow the Commission to rule on the matters before the April 10 hearing in 2018-2-E. Please let me know if the Commission requires something additional from the parties in order to expedite this process, including a motion to expedite if needed.

Notably, if SBA's motion to bifurcate is allowed, that may provide an opportunity for a longer response time from SCE&G on the 2017-2-E petition. If the Commission allows for additional time and opportunity to file supplemental testimony related to SCE&G's PR-2 rate and proposed avoided cost methodology changes, then the request to expedite the petition's consideration may be less urgent.

Blan

Blan Holman
Southern Environmental Law Center
463 King St. - Suite B
Charleston, SC 29403

p. 843 720 5270

www.southernenvironment.org

From: Butler, David [David.Butler@psc.sc.gov]

Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 2:01 PM

To: K. Chad Burgess; Benjamin Mustian; Bateman, Andrew; Pittman, Jenny; alex@shissiaslawfirm.com; Richard Whitt; tfrogers@austinrogerspa.com; Richard Whitt; Scott Elliott; Blan Holman

Subject: DN 2018-2-E - Two Outstanding Motions

To the Parties:

We are going to have an outstanding Petition and an outstanding Motion in this Docket, one of which I have seen and one of which I have not. And these are:

1. A Petition by SCCCL and SACE for an Order requiring that SCE&G comply with Commission Order No. 2018-55 (which I have seen);
2. A Motion by the South Carolina Solar Business Alliance and/or Southern Current to bifurcate the fuel hearing (which I have not seen);

Do some of the parties in this Docket intend to file responses to these documents? I am just checking.

Thanks,

David Butler

Standing Hearing Officer